REMARKS

We have carefully considered the Office Action dated September 22, 2006, in which claims 12-13 and 15-19 are rejected as anticipated by US Patent Application Publication 2002/0022952 to Zager et al, claims 1-11 are rejected as obvious over Zager in view of US Patent 6,295,527 to McCormack et al., and claim 14 is rejected as obvious over Zager in view of US Patent 6,947,989 to Gullotta et al. We thank the Examiner for a telephone conference in which it was confirmed that the BelManage User's Guide (version 6) and an Information Disclosure Statement and attached references were not scanned into the patent office file, and thus, were not reviewed by the Examiner. In response, we have provided a copy of the User's Guide by facsimile and a copy of the Information Disclosure Statement and attached references with this Response. We believe that these duplicate submissions should satisfy the Rule 105 Request.

We have amended claims 1 and 7 for clarity, essentially adding punctuation and correcting a typographical error.

Section 112 Rejection

With respect to the antecedent basis rejection of claims 10 and 11, we point out that the term "predetermined positions" set forth in claim 10 takes its basis from claim 1 paragraph D, and the same term in claim 11 takes its antecedent basis from the last paragraph of claim 8. We believe that the respective term in claims 10 and 11 thus have proper antecedent basis.

Sections 102 and 103 Rejections

With respect to the section 102 and 103 rejections based, respectively, entirely and primarily on the Zager reference, we point out that the Zager reference describes a system that produces a model of a network or multiple interconnected networks. The network model is based on network discovery operations. The discovery operations are based on network configuration information, defined model elements and so forth, that are provided to the system by a network administrator. The Zager system thereafter relies on information contained in the model to produce reports of the effects of various

8

network events or changes to network devices. See, generally, Abstract. Thus, the Zager system operates in a different manner and for a different purpose than that current invention.

With respect to the rejection of claims 12-13 and 15-19 as anticipated, we point out that claim 12 states, in part,

> grouping the plurality of computers in groups that are nodes of a multiple node tree in accordance **with user-specified primary grouping criteria and secondary grouping criteria that are values of computer profile data of interest.**

The cited Zager reference, and in particular cited paragraph 0076, describes using "managed objects" that correspond to "arbitrary groupings of similar objects in the model." As set forth in the cited paragraph, the administrator can define as an object "any particular user group that has significance to the operation of the business enterprise or the like to which the external system belongs." In deed, in paragraph 0281, the Zager reference states that the system administrator may manually intervene to specify the groupings, though there is no explanation of how the groupings are specified by the "manual intervention." Thus, while the Zager reference describes using groupings to define objects, or MOs, of its model, the Zager reference does not show any particular criteria for the groupings. In particular, the Zager reference does not show **grouping computers in accordance with** *primary grouping criteria and secondary grouping criteria that are values of computer profile data of interest.*

The Examiner also cites paragraph 0274. This paragraph describes a step in the network discovery process. Using a list of networks, subnets, subnet ranges, hosts or host ranges that are supplied by a system administrator, the Zager system determines "a list of subnets to discover." Thereafter, the system administrator may manually aid the discovery operations, as discussed in paragraph 0281.

The discovery process described in Zager is used to set up the system model, not to group computers for reporting the attribute thereof. The Zager reference does not show **grouping computers in accordance with primary grouping criteria and secondary grouping criteria that are values of computer profile data of interest** and, in particular, grouping the computers in this manner for the purpose of providing summaries of the attributes of the computers in the group and in groups that are in the subtree that has the given group as its root, as is set forth in claim 12.

Specifically, claim 12 includes the step of

> manipulating the database data to produce
> **summaries of attributes of the computers in a given**
> **group and in the groups in the subtree that has the**
> **given group as its root.**

There is no showing in the Zager reference of producing such summaries. Rather, the Zager system models the discovered system to provide information concerning how an event or change to a given device potentially affects other devices in the system. See, paragraph 0078. In paragraph 0082 cited by the Examiner, the Zager reference describes using filters to determine "what information *in the model* is to be made available to what users of the system." (emphasis added). While reports may be generated as set forth in paragraph 0083, there is no showing that the reports are **summaries of attributes of the computers in a given group and in the groups in the sub-tree that has the given group as its root.**

The filtering is described in more detail in paragraph 0133, which states that the filter provides to users information relating to incidents or events of interest. There is thus no showing that the filter provides to users information about computer attributes and, in particular, summaries of attributes of the computers in a given group and in the groups in the subtree that has the given group as its root, as is set forth in claim 12.

The Zager reference does not anticipate the invention as set forth in independent claim 12 for the reasons discussed above. Further, there is no showing, teaching or

suggestion in Zager of using ranges of values for the primary and secondary criteria, or of re-grouping the computers based on using different primary and secondary criteria, as set forth in the claims that depend from claim 12. Accordingly, Zager does not anticipate claims 13 and 15-19, which depend from claim 12.

Claims 1-11 are rejected as obvious over a combination of Zager and McCormack. The McCormack reference does not supply the missing teachings to Zager, however, and thus the combination does not teach or suggest the invention as set forth in claims 1-11.

McCormack teaches using multiple selected criteria to retrieve selected information from a database. Thus, a user can specify particular criteria and receive information about devices that satisfy the criteria. The example provided in the reference involves a user specifying particular device types and IOS versions, and receiving information about the respective devices which are the specified types and running the specified IOS version software. See, Column 12, lines 6-15. While these devices may be considered a group, there is no teaching in McCormack of **providing reports that summarize the attributes of the computers in the groups and including in the report for a given group the attributes of the computers in the groups that are in the subtree that has the group as its root,** as set forth in independent claim 1 and 7. The teaching of McCormack thus does not add to Zager at least the missing step of producing the reports set forth in independent claims 1 and 7.

A combination of the teaching of Zager and McCormack does not teach or suggest the invention as set forth in independent claims 1 and 7, and the claims that depend therefrom because, *inter alia*, the combination does not teach or suggest the method of grouping computers using primary and secondary grouping criteria for the purpose of providing reports that summarize of the attributes of the computers in the groups and and including in the report for a given group the attributes of the computers in the groups that are in the subtree that has the group as its root group.

The claims, as amended, should be in form for allowance. We request that the Examiner enter the Amendment and issue a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

Please charge any fee occasioned by this paper to our Deposit Account No. 03-1237.

Respectfully submitted,

Patricia A. Sheehan
Reg. No. 32,301
CESARI AND MCKENNA, LLP
88 Black Falcon Avenue
Boston, MA 02210-2414
(617) 951-2500